



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,684	07/10/2003	Ronald E. Dooley	20008/G058A	2570
34431 7590 03/10/2010 HANLEY, FLIGHT & ZIMMERMAN, LLC 150 S. WACKER DRIVE SUITE 2100 CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER NICHOLSON III, LESLIE AUGUST				
ART UNIT 3651		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/10/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mhanley@hfzlaw.com
jflight@hfzlaw.com
docketing@hfzlaw.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/616,684

Applicant(s)

DOOLEY, RONALD E.

Examiner

LESLIE A. NICHOLSON III

Art Unit

3651

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Due to Applicant arguments and/or amendments, all previous 35 USC 112 rejections are hereby withdrawn.

Regarding the claims rejected under 35 USC 251, see ¶5-7 below.

Oath/Declaration

2. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1), a supplemental reissue oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

Claims 1-34 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue Declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251. See 37 CFR 1.175 because a supplemental Declaration is needed for the amendment to the claims subsequent to when the last declaration was filed, that includes the clause shown below.

Receipt of an appropriate supplemental oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) will overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251. An example of acceptable language to be used in the supplemental oath/declaration is as follows:

"Every error in the patent which was corrected in the present reissue application, and is not covered by a prior oath/declaration submitted in this application, arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant."

Claim Objections

3. Claim 11 is objected to because the first amendment to claim 11 (conveyor;) was already present in the patented version of the claims, therefore, the amendment is improper under 37 CFR 1.173.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-10,12-15 are allowed.

Claim 11 would be allowed if corrected as shown in ¶13 above.

Reissue Applications

5. Claims 16-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Pannu v. Storz Instruments Inc.*, 258 F.3d 1366, 59 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to claim subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope of claim subject matter surrendered in the

application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

6. The "recapture rule," prevents a patentee from regaining, through a reissue patent, subject matter that the patentee surrendered in an effort to obtain allowance of claims in the patent sought to be reissued. *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 1468, 45 USPQ2d 1161, 1164 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Clement discusses a three-step test for analyzing recapture:

Step 1 involves a determination of whether and in what aspect any claims sought to be reissued are broader than the patent claims.

Step 2 involves a determination of whether the broader aspects of the reissue application claims relate to surrendered subject matter.

Step 3 is applied when the broadening relates to surrendered subject matter and involves a determination whether the surrendered subject matter has crept into the reissue application claim.

Substep (3): if the reissue claim is broader in some aspects, but narrower in others, then:

- (a) if the reissue claim is as broad as or broader in an aspect germane to a prior art rejection, but narrower in another aspect completely unrelated to the rejection, the recapture rule bars the claim;
- (b) if the reissue claim is narrower in an aspect germane to [a] prior art rejection, and broader in an aspect unrelated to the rejection, the recapture rule does not bar the claim, but other rejections are possible.

The Federal Circuit in *North American Container, Inc. v. Plastipak Packaging, Inc.*, 415 F.3d at 1350, 75 USPQ2d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 2005) further refined Substep (3)(a) of *Clement* to define "broader in an aspect germane to a prior art rejection" to mean broader with respect to a specific limitation

- (1) added to overcome prior art in prosecution of the application which matured into the patent sought to be reissued and
- (2) eliminated in the reissue application claims.

"Surrendered subject matter" is defined in connection with prosecution history estoppel in *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, , 535 U.S. 722, 733-34, 122 S. Ct. 1831, 1838, 62 USPQ2d 1705, 1710-11 (2002). A patentee's decision to narrow his claims through amendment "may be presumed to be a general disclaimer of the territory between the original claim and the amended claim." *Exhibit Supply*, 315 U.S., at 136-137, 62 S. Ct. 513. "...in determining whether 'surrender' of subject matter has occurred, the proper inquiry is whether an objective observer viewing the prosecution history would conclude that the purpose of the patentee's

amendment or argument was to overcome prior art and secure the patent." Kim v. ConAgra Foods, Inc., 465 F.3d 1312, 1323, 80 USPQ2d 1495, 1502 (Fed. Cir. 2006).

A further opinion, *Ex parte Eggert*, 67 USPQ2d 1716 (BPAI 2003), issued by the Board of Appeals and Interferences as a precedential opinion, is also part of the recapture precedent applicable to proceedings before the United States Patent & Trademark Office (USPTO). *Eggert* was entered on May 29, 2003, prior to the Federal Circuit's *North American Container* decision. In *Eggert* the majority held that the surrendered subject matter was the rejected claim **only** rather than the amended portion of the issued claim.

A published precedential opinion of the Board is binding unless the views expressed in an opinion in support of the decision, among a number of things, are inconsistent with a decision of the Federal Circuit. In this case, the majority view in *Eggert* is believed to be inconsistent with the subsequent Federal Circuit decision in *North American Container* with respect to the principles governing application of Substep (3)(a) of *Clement*. See: *Ex parte Franklin C. Bradshaw and Thomas L. Soderman*, (Appeal 2006-2744 Bd. Pat. App. & Int. July 19, 2007) (available in Application 09/664,794 and at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/its/fd062744.pdf>); *Ex parte Raanan Liebermann*, (Appeal 2007-0012 Bd. Pat. App. & Int. May 2007) (available in Application 09/603,247 and at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/its/fd070012.pdf>); *Ex parte Willibald Kraus* (Appeal 2005-0841 Bd. Pat. App. & Int. April 2005) (available in Application 08/230,083 and at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/its/fd050841.pdf>)

As set forth in the above BPAI decisions, based on *North American Container* and other court decisions, surrendered subject matter is considered the subject matter of an application claim which was amended or canceled and, on a limitation-by-limitation basis, the territory falling between the scope of

- (a) the application claim which was canceled or amended and
- (b) the patent claim which was ultimately issued.

Accordingly, the "surrendered subject matter" that may not be recaptured through reissue should *be presumed* to include subject matter broader than the patent claims in a manner directly related to

- (1) limitations added to the claims by amendment (either by amending an existing claim or canceling a claim and replacing it with a new claim with that limitation) to overcome a patentability rejection and
- (2) limitations argued to overcome a patentability rejection without amendment of a claim.

However, when reissue claims are narrower than the patent claims with respect to features other than the surrender generating feature, then the reissue claims may be materially narrowed relative to the claims prosecuted and issued in the patent, thereby avoiding the recapture rule.

As explained in *Hester Industries, Inc. v Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472,1480, 46 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (Fed. Cir. 1998), the recapture rule is avoided when two conditions are satisfied. First, an aspect of the invention must have been overlooked (e.g., not claimed) during patent prosecution. Second, the reissue claim must have been materially narrowed with respect to this overlooked aspect of the invention.

In summary, the recapture rule is avoided if the reissue claim was materially narrowed in other respects compared to its broadening surrendered aspect. A reissue claim is materially narrowed and thus avoids the recapture rule when limited to aspects of the invention:

- (1) which had not been claimed and thus were overlooked during prosecution of the original patent application; and
- (2) which patentably distinguish over the prior art.

7. Only amendments and/or arguments made to define over art rejections are deemed to be surrendered subject matter. Applicant argued, in the response filed 6/14/2000, why each of the independent claims were patentably distinct over the art used to reject the claims. The limitations that correspond to these arguments are thus considered the surrendered generating limitations. These limitations must be retained essentially word-for-word in any claim in the reissue. Therefore, recapture is still present.

The last indented limitation of each of new independent claims 16,21,27,31 have been amended from previously presented claims 1-15. These limitations must be retained in any broadened reissue claims, can no longer be broadened, and must be retained substantially exactly as they appear in the patented claims. Reissue claims having these surrendered limitations broadened are guilty of recapture.

For the reissue claims to, for certain, not be guilty of recapture, the Examiner recommends rewriting claims 16-34 to be verbatim of claims 1-15 with the exception of the error(s) indicated in the declaration filed 7/16/2009.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LESLIE A. NICHOLSON III whose telephone number is (571)272-5487. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene Crawford can be reached on 571-272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/616,684

Page 8

Art Unit: 3651

3/3/2010